

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application, in view of the following remarks and accompanying claim amendments, is respectfully requested. Independent Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 18 and 19 have been amended to clarify the grammar and to add the limitation “related to the display position or the scroll method.” Support for the limitation can be found at least in Figure 3 and page 9, lines 8-12 of the specification. No new matter has been added in this amendment. Claims 1-5, 8-13 and 15-31 are all the claims pending in the application.

By way of summary, the Official Action dated February 16, 2011, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 8-13, and 15-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holtz et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub No. 2002/0109710, hereafter “Holtz”) in view of Martin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0143944, hereafter “Martin.”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons which follow.

In the Official Action, the Examiner takes the position (page 4) that “Holtz fails to disclose: a scroll speed calculation means calculates said scroll speed of the text on the basis of a time length of series information section being reproduced.” The Examiner relies upon paragraph [0048] of Holtz for a suggestion of this feature. However, each of the independent Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 18, and 19, as currently amended, requires a user instruction input means (105) for dynamically changing the text display setting information related to the display position or the scroll method (see, Fig. 3, page 9, lines 8-12 of the specification).

In contrast with this limitation now recited in each of Applicant’s independent claims, Holtz may disclose a mechanism for changing Font Size 2266 and/or Bold Text 2264 of Fig. 22. However, neither Holtz nor Martin disclose or suggest a mechanism for freely setting the display position or a mechanism for changing the scroll method, as currently claimed. In Martin,

Paragraph [0040] of Martin describes breaking the message into a plurality of display lines based on the text size, and that the amount of time to audibly broadcast each line is compiled by summing embedded queue times. The scroll rate for each line is calculated individually by each display 80. As a result, each line of text will have a different scroll rate, depending on the total time required for the line. From the above portion of Martin relied upon by the Examiner, and Applicant's review of the Martin reference, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Martin that would teach or suggest "a user instruction input means for dynamically changing the text display setting information related to the display position or the scroll method," as recited in each of Applicant's independent claims. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 18, and 19, and the claims which depend therefrom, are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

From all of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stuart S. Levy/
Stuart S. Levy
Registration No. 61,474

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 16, 2011